MEETING SUMMARY
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

ATTENDEES: Steve Hirsch, Tom Zuckerman, Lance Johnson, George Barnes, Michael Hoover, Harlan Glines, Wendy Halverson Martin, Doug Kleinsmith, Spreck Rosenkrans, Stein Buer, Jim White, Carolyn Yale, Jim Spence, Jim Martin, Chet Bowling, Terri Anderson, Jean Elder, Terry Erlewine, Tom Howard, Stuart Robertson, Dan Fults.

SUMMARY

A meeting was held on Friday, September 27, 1996 to begin to discuss appropriate assumptions and criteria for the CALFED existing conditions and No-Action Alternative scenarios. An agenda, list of attendees, and materials passed out at the meeting are attached. This memorandum summarizes the questions and comments about existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative and discussion points that were raised at the meeting regarding the comparison table. Apparent agreements that were reached at the meeting are presented in italics below the discussion point.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Level of Development

Existing Conditions

- CALFED should use the term "existing" level of development instead of "1995". Use of a specific year invites confusion over what is actually being described.

  While the participants generally agreed with this concept, concern was expressed about consistency with other similar efforts that used the "1995" terminology. The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Delta Standards

Existing Conditions

- CALFED should describe actual existing conditions and not rely on existing standards to describe conditions. For example, standards set minimum conditions that are often exceeded in the real world. CALFED needs to recognize this fact.

Participants agreed that existing conditions should describe the conditions as they have occurred in the field and not rely on minimum flow standards and other parameters that are contained in the Bay-Delta standards. The standards provide the rules for operating the simulation models, which rely on historic data for input. The simulation models are used to represent what would have occurred under a variety of hydrologic conditions if today's water supply demands and facilities had been present during the hydrologic period of record. The purpose of the existing conditions and No-Action Alternative modeling efforts is to provide a method of comparing the action alternatives developed by CALFED. The action alternatives will be compared to both existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative.

- How will in-Delta standards be modelled? The discussion of standards contained in the draft DWRSIM assumptions sheets discusses only inflow and outflow standards.

  DWRSIM does not model interior Delta water quality standard compliance. Output from the model is used as input to DWRDSM, which in turn is used to verify that flow and salinity standards are met.

- Recent modelling indicates that the Vernalis flow standard cannot be met under current modelling assumptions that rely only on the CVP/SWP to meet the standard. Other efforts have simply assumed that the standard would be met. Is this an accurate portrayal of the issue?

  The group agreed that the effort should proceed based on the approach that has been used in other similar efforts(i.e., that the flow standards will be met), but indicated that changes in the modelling effort may be needed in the future. The SWRCB process may provide guidance.

- San Joaquin River assumptions should be more clearly spelled out in the DWRSIM assumption sheets.

  Assumptions relating to the San Joaquin River will be more specifically stated in the next version of the DWRSIM assumption sheets for CALFED.

- D-1485 should be used as the Delta standards for the existing conditions scenario for a number of reasons.

- The Bay-Delta Accord and the biological opinions should be used to describe existing Bay-Delta water quality standards.

The group discussed this issue at length. The proposal was to use the 1995 WQCP standards in the modeling effort, but to discuss in the Programmatic EIR/EIS the effects various recent developments have had on water supply and hydrology. We will explore

this issue further with the individuals suggesting the changes from the 1995 WQCP to ensure that these concerns are captured.

No Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

American River Standards

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Sacramento River Standards

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Banks Export

Existing Conditions

- A footnote should be added to the summary table row discussing exports from the Banks pumping plant to indicate that the export includes higher export flows when San Joaquin River flows are high.

The higher limitations under certain circumstances is recognized. A footnote will be added to the summary table.

No-Action Alternative

See above.

Tracy Export

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Folsom Reservoir Operations

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA)

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

Trinity River Flows

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

- Trinity River flows are the subject of a separate long-term study.

  The group generally agreed with the proposed approach, which currently assumes a Trinity River minimum flow of 340,000 acre-feet in all years along with a commitment to conduct a sensitivity analysis of different flow allocations to bracket the potential impacts of further reallocation of Trinity River flows.

Monterey Agreement

Existing Conditions

- The Monterey Agreement should be included in the existing conditions modelling effort.

  There was agreement that the Monterey Agreement has been in place for a short time. As it has been in place for a little while, discussion centered on whether is was appropriate for it to be a reflection of what has been occurring in the recent past. Questions were also raised as to whether adding something like the Monterey Agreement would open the door for other requests to include recent efforts to be a part of existing conditions as well. The general opinion of all participants was to add the Monterey Agreement to existing conditions.

No-Action Alternative

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

CVP and SWP Demands

Existing Conditions

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

No-Action Alternative

- Tabulated future CVP agricultural and M&I demand values need to be checked to ensure that the values are correct.

  The demands will checked.

- The term "demand" needs to be defined and the basis of the demands needs to be clarified. The basis of DWR and CVP demands should be consistent within each model run.

  The term "demand" will be clarified and the basis of CVP and SWP demands will be reviewed to ensure consistency.

Refuge Demands

Existing Conditions

- The existing conditions model effort should show level beyond Level II because refuges are currently receiving Level II plus 30% of the incremental increase to Level IV.

  New data will be gathered to accurately portray this situation in the CALFED modeling effort.

Responsibility for Meeting Bay-Delta Standards

Existing Conditions

- The Coordinated Operations Agreement does not apply to the new WQCP standards.

  The group noted this fact but agreed that the existing COA is the only methodology available to date. As better information becomes available, it will be incorporated into the modelling assumptions package.

No-Action Alternative

See above.

Other Topics

- Is Cross-Valley wheeling included in the modeling assumptions?

  The DWRSIM assumption sheets include Cross-Valley wheeling as part of the assumption package for both existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative.